## THE BROOKLYN SCANDAL.

Continuation of Moulton's Cross-Examination.

SETTLING WITH BOWEN.

Tilton Thinks Mrs. Morse a Dangerous Woman.

TO A FRIEND IN THE WEST.

How Plaintiff and Defendant Kept Accounts.

The sleigh belis, jingting merrity, in the staid city of Brooklyn, and the sleighs filled with happy families of married couples and children, taking advantage of the snow, gave such a chill to the court room yesterday that the dullest sympathy was moved by the picture of domestic discord there. A wife was looking calmly on at a litigious husband. Another husband, alleged to be her seducer, was surrounded with his brood, waiting for the awful verdict. It was a stern representation of justice to see all these beings and their social forces facing each other in the little square hall of justice while the many sleigh bells made music in the keen outer

There was Colonel Beecher, the defendant's son, with his pretty, girlish wife, of whom he seemed to be quite fond. Happy will they be, looking at this contentious scene, if they deduce from it the lesson all important, if earliest learned, that "a long pull is a strong pull," and every misstep on a vital

thing of sworn confidence returns to plague the

inventor.

Mr. Beecher came in shortly before the opening. with his wife. His hairs are rapidly changing gray. A baid spot is at the back of the crown, where his long hairs are parted. He walks with a slight stoop and wears an old mantle or talma, which removing he sits erectly in his chair and soberly watches the performance. Mr. Beech-r, like all the dramatis persona, has changed conduct during the trial. He began it, under the incitement of its novelty and publicity, with an exuberance of confidence and a certain amount of enjoyment of its droil-ness. He has for several days past been conspicuous for his sobriety and negativeness, and his coarsest adversary could not observe anything in his conduct to criticise. Yesterday he listened attentively with a face set to the key of heaven's comfort and the pitch of the earth's satiety. He moved forward among his lawyers and spent that extent of time be saved by works as well as by faith. A nigh idea of his intellect is held by his adversaries at the Bar, and they say that they see the very finest

of his intensect is held by his adversaries at the Bar, and they say that they see the very finest touches of the defence in his personal suggestions. His lorty forehead, his eyes, which are like natural cameras to receive all the impressions of nature from forms to temperatures; his extended face, ampire in every feature, not one criweding the other, and his high, tipe color, the mellow ripeness of an appreciative old age, insensibly attract the study and admiration of men. That he was created and perfected to communicate to his fellows the subtletes and profound lessons of the life of which they were a part is manifest by the exquisiteness of his sensibility, which is expressed, fixe a sensitive plant's, as every object touches him. The command to go and preach would appear to have ocen superfluous to one gritted with the splendor of his graces and sensibilities. He looks also the loity oracle, involuntarily speaking the truths of an irrestable authority. No wonder, as we have said before, that his people gather around him in child-like latth and see in him inherent process of the reality of his commission and inspiration from on high.

Miss. EEECHER

was attentive as ever by his side yesterday, and drew a cead on Frank Monton all day. She kept up the cold smile, like sunsaine on show, she has had all this while, and spoke sometimes to her nusband and son, quaintly and crisply.

By Mr. Beecher's side was

USIN D. PULION.

the celebrated pastor of the baptist church, who

By Mr. Beecher's side was

JUSTIN D. PULIFON.

the celebrated pastor of the Raplist church, who
got in a snarp fight with Thion some years ago on
the subject of beer drinking. Fulton attacked
Tilton's latitudinarian notions in the Independent,
it is said, on the subject of drinking are and beer.
Tilton responded by saying that Folion himself
had drunk layer beer with Tilton at a Bowery garden after one of Futton's sermons. This was denied. A quarret ensued and Tilton, bening inside the press, got the nominal advantage. This incensed Mr. Futton, who
endeavored to have a press of his own; but failing
to get support for it in Boston came to live in

as one of Thion's old victims in happier years, whinam M. Evaris being another.

For the first time

A PRIEST OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

appeared in court—Rev. Father Carroll, of St.
Vincent de Pau's caurch, williamsburg. He looked on very quietly, and had actifier the expression of pain nor enjoyment.

THE USUAL SET OF FEMALES

were present—Filten, Field, Haymond and Shearman. They had precisely the same seats and behaved as usual, quietly and without interference. There were no flowers. Mrs. Thion listens, looks around, keeps her ven up and snows human nature, as it unaware that just how human nature is leeing her with great uniformity. It is a nappy gift of Providence to make all collars fit us, after a while, without chafing. Lattle Dorit, raised in the Marshaisea Jail, took her life as heroically as Mrs. Thion, coming somewhat later into open court. Her manner is a good deal like that of the Irishman's, who, asked to piead guilty or not guity, replied that he could not say till he had heard the evidence. She is getting it all.

No THE BENCH

were Mavor Hunter, of Brooklyn; Associate Judge Reynolds, who formerly was the first lawyer of Brooklyn, and State Senator Morphy. They all watched the case without indifference.

Tilton was grave and quiet.

MOULTON

submitted to a very poute and much improved style of cross-examination without resentment or sulienness, and up to the middle of the alternoon session held his own fairly. He is a study—not for anything mysterious in him, but for the apparent incompatibility of such coo behavior with such a nervous temperament, he answers with readiness and

of the alternoon session held his own fairly. He is a study—not for anything mysterious in him, but for the appearant incompationility of such coor behavior with such a nervous temperament. He answers with readiness and precision, and does not appear to reduire \*\*Amesseto\* neutralize the cross-examination. It is probably the quiet culture of his evenings and his associations which is coming to his relief in this extremity. The hours he has given to the nooler part of his mind refurn to do him service when outliness habits, weath and wordly comfort are superscied by the inexorable. Very fittle was obtained from Mr. Moulton yesterday to affect this jury. Much that was sought to be elicited productly would have had no jury influence. Very much was inquired into of an amusing irretevancy, and the perfect courtesy on both slots made the trial of character by talent the state of armed neutrality.

\*\*Woodbriff in Court.\*\*

A very suggestive thing was the appearance of Moulton's senior partner, Woodruff, who is not a relative of its, out, on the contrary, a very conservative and unintrusive man. He entered with Moulton and set by his side, and in this act dissipated the rumor that he was malcontent or dissatisfied with Moulton's behavior. Woodruff is one of the great merchanis of the period—a square, solid, anophinomated, gray-beared man. He is at the head of the recom party of Brooklyn, which opposes what is caised the Ring.

\*\*Today the testimony relates itself.\*\*

\*\*The Evidence.\*\*

Francis D. Moulton cross-examined by Judge Porter—I had the account you referred to, and handed it to my bookkeeper to put it in shape, and I will have it at one o'clock; Mr. Thiton's account he has dimself; if you choose I can hand in both accounts at one time; I should say that I saw Mr. Recener almost as irequently at my house; we were in the habit of making excursions together during the summer; we went fishing logether and have been to Narragansett togener; I think the woman's rights movement; I have been present with Mr. Thiton was

but as they could not find it Judge Fullerton sug-gested that they use the printed copy and substi-ture the original when it is found. Judge Porior then read:—

Mr. U. C. Bowen:

SIE-4 hereby authorize Mr. Francis D. Moulton to act in my behat in tull sattlement with you of all my accounts growing out of my contracts for services to the independent and the Brooklyn Daily Cases.

The ODO RE TILTON. Judge Porter-Acting under that letter how much did you receive from Mr. Bowen for Mr.

Judge Potter—Acting under that letter how much did you receive from Mr. Bowen for Mr. Allion:

Mr. Beach—We object to that.

Judge Neison, however, did not sustain the objection, and the witness proceeded:—The amount was settled by arbitration; it was \$7,000; I never received any money from Mr. Beecher, except for the tuition of Bessie Turner and for Mr. Tiiton's use: I received \$5,000 in one amount, and some other sums were received from June, 1871, to May, 1873, making somewhere between \$6,000 and \$7,000 in air; I never visited Mrs. Beecher; my intimacy with her has obsenvery slight; I have met Mrs. Morse several times; very pleasanily when I mether; my relations with her were of a friendly nature; I met her once at Mr. Thiod's and once in the house she was living in in Schermerhorn street; I do not reconlect the date of my visity but I will try and remember before I leave the stand; I have met Mrs. Hooker two or three stand; I have met Mrs. Hooker two or three times; i met her once in hichmond, at a woman's rigues meeting, in 1871; I either introduced Mrs. Hooker or Mrs. Davis; I did not preside there; I did not go to the convention with either of those ladies; I went with my wife and son and Mrs. Sarah Sutherland Eddy and her daughter; they were not delegates to the convention; on the evening of December 31, I think it was, when I went to Beecher's house, I said to him, "I understand that Mrs. Beecher is repeating stories ngainst Mrs. Thiton; now such stories ought to be stopped; they only tend to increase troubles," and he said to me that Mrs. Beecher here was the substance of what he said—and her ensity to Mr. Tiiton might induce her to listen to Mrs. Morse, and he would try and control it; that is as near as I remember; Mr. Beecher to resign and leave town—that is to say, I disapproved of it without the signature of Bowen; the letter was completed on either January I or 2; it was not sent to Mr. Bowen; I did not disapprove of his writing the date inquired of by the counsel; it seems to me that there shou

that there should be some distinction made between them.

Mr. Porter—There should be if there is the least doubt. You understand it to be the letter in which he repeated the charges of Mr. Bowen against Mr. Beecher?

Moulton—That is the letter I am addressing myself to sir.

against ar, becomer;

Moulton—That is the letter I am addressing myself to, sir.

Mr. Fullerton—There are two letters of January I, 1871. A. I did not know anything about that subhecation, nor did Mr. Tilton, as he told me alterwards; I advised against its publication in January, 1871; I do not remember that it was ever printed by Mr. Tilton I do not remember that it was ever printed in the Golden Age; I saw proofs of an article prepared by Mr. Tilton in which was incorporated this letter of Mr. Bowen's; I advised then against its publication; Mr. Tilton showed me those proofs; I saw the poem "Sir Marmadure's Musings," after it was printed; I thought it ought not to have been published; i told him so; I do not remember having heard of the blography of Victoria Woodhall before it appeared; I did not approve of the publication; I remember a letter to a literal in the West; the letter you have just handed me is in Mr. Thito's handwriting.

Judge Porter then read—

To a FRIEND IN THE WEST.

Juge Porter then read:

TO A FRIEND IN THE WEST.

Livinuston Siners, Brookleys, Dec. 31, 1872.

My Dear Priend—I owe you a long letter. I am unwell and a prisoner in the house, leaning back in leather cushioned iddeness, and writing on my char board before the fire. Perhaps you wonder that I have a fire, or anything but a hearthstone troken and crumbled, since the world has been told that my household is in runs. And yet it is more like your last letter—brimful of love and wit, and sparking like a fountain in midwinter.

Nevertheless you are right. I am in trouble, and I hardly see a path out of it.

It is just two years ago to day—this very day—the last of the year, that Mr. Bowen litted his hammer, and with an unjust blow smote sunder my two contracts, one with the ladependent and the other with the Brook-lyn Union. The public little suspect that this act of his turned on his fear to meet the consequences of hornible charges which he made against Henry Ward Beecher. I have kept quiet on the subject for two years through an unwilliagness to harm others even for the sake of righting myself cefore the public. But having trusted to time for my vindication, I find that ume has only thickened my difficulties until these now buffet me like a storm.

You know that Bowen long ago paid to me the as-ested pecuniary damages which serve until the production of my course, and songthing like an apollogy for his.

solved pecuniary damages which grew out of his breaking of the contracts, and gave me a written vindication
of the contracts, and gave me a written vindication
of my course, and something like an apology for his,
The settlement, so tar as Fum concerned, is final.
But Bower's assassinating dauger drawn against
Beecher has proved as unable as Macbeth's to "trainmel
up the consequence." And the consequence is that the
air of Brosklyn is rife with stories against its either
cargyman, not growing out of the Woothuil scandal
meroly, but exhaled with ever tresh folianess, like mephite vapors, from Bowen's own charge against
secoler.

needler. Verily, the tongue is a wild beast that no man can tame, and like a wolf it is now seeking to devour the chief shepherd of the fleck, together also with my own pretty lambs.

chief shit like a word it is dow seeking to devour the chief sheeberd of the flock, together also with my own pretty lambs.

For the last. I have bartily had a restrut day; and I be a subject to the last. I have bartily had a restrut day; and I be subject to the last. I have be subject thing over at night, waking the next morning until for word the last. I have to suffer the keenest possible injustice? It not, come and learn of me. To say nothing of the wrong and insult to my wife, in whose serrow I have greater sorrow, I have to bear the additional indignity of being misconstrued by half the public and by many friends.

For instance, it is supposed that I had a conspirator's hand to this unboly ousiness, whereas I am as innocent of it as of the Nathan murder.

It is hinted that the libelious article was actually written by me, whereas being in the north of New Hampshire? I do not know on its existence till a week after it had convisied my own city and tamily. My write the control of the convision of the second to receive sake.

Then, too, it is the sneer of the cinis that I have degenerated into an apostle of free love, whereas the whole body of my writings stands like a monument against this execrable theory.

Moreover, It is charged that I am in financial and

whole body of my writings stands like a morument against this excerable theory.

Moreover, it is charged that I am in financial and other relations with Mrs. Woodhull, whereas I have not showen to, nor met, nor seen her for nearly a year.

The instory of my acqualitance with her is this:—In the spring of 1571, a few months after howen charged Beecher with the most hissons crime known to human mature, and had shammed the door of the Independent in my race, and when I was toling like Heronies to keep the scandal from the public, then it was that Mrs. Woodhull, hitherto a tolai stranger to me, suddenly sent for me and poured into my ears, not the Bowen scandal, but a new one of her own, namely almost ine same identical take which she printed a few weeks ago. Think of all when I was doing my heat to suppress one earthquake. Ars. Woodhull, suddenly stood before me portulated which she printed a few weeks ago. Think of all when I was doing my heat to suppress one earthquake. Ars. Woodhull suddenly stood before me portulated which she printed a few weeks ago. Think of all when I was a final to do! I resolved a could securely be up the original was about a final of the could be a final she would publish what a fool and as the result proves, like a fool, and yet with a fool and as the result proves, the a fool, and yet with a fool and as the result proves, the a fool, and yet with a fool and me that she would never thisk of doing me such a haro. So I rendered her some important services dicloding especially some labors of pen and ink), all with a view to put and hold her under an obligation to me and mine. In so acting toward her I found, to my glad surprise and astonishment, that she cose almost as high in my estimation as she had done with Lucretia Mott. Elizabeth Cauly Stanton, isabella Beecher Hooker and other excellent women. Nooled who has not met Mrs. Wood hull ean have an adequate idea of the admirable important when the surface movement that I suddenly opened my eyes to her real tendencies to mischer, and then

dozen representative women of the suffrage movement that I suddenly opened my eyes to her real tendencies to mischer, and then it was that I indignantly repudiated her acquaintance and have never seen her since.

Well, it is over, and I am left to be the chief sufferer in the public estimation.

What to do in the emergency (which is not clearing but clouding liself daily) i have not yet decided.

What I could do would be to take from my ortting desk and publish to-morrow morning the prepared narravive and vindication, which, with facts and documents, my legal at sivers pronounce compete.

This would explain and clarity everything, both great and small (including the Wool hull episode, which is but a minor part of the whole case), but if I publish it must not only violate a kind of honorable oscillation to be silent which I had voluntarily imposed upon myself, but I know that all Plymouth Church would hunt bin but an accompany of the most purmy old triend Sowen to a serious risk of but an accompany would deserve the fate I cannot say; but I know that all Plymouth Church would hunt bin but an accompany of the more many part of the without my own hand, but, whatever happens to my weather-beaten self, i wish to you, O prosperous contrade, a happy New Year. Fraternally yours.

P. S. —Before sending this long letter (which pays my debit to you? I have read it to my wife, who desires to supplement it by sending this long letter (which pays my debit to you? I have read it to my wife, who desires to supplement it by sending her love and good will to the line white cottage and its little red once as.

Witness —I received that letter from Tilton; I do not remember to whom it was addressed; I do not know to whom it was addressed; I do not know to whom it was addressed; I do not know to whom it was addressed; I do not know to whom it was addressed; I do not remember twee sense; I know here it is the spring of 1871, somewhere in April; I beheve I met hor arst at her house in New York; our next meeting, and the propage of the

and demanded a paper from him under threat of instant death; I never stated anything to that effect; I never charged Beecher with a piteous, be-seconing manner; you asked me a momen; and whether I read any part of that statement or whether I read any part of that statement or whether I read the whole of it; I can tell you; I did read that part about the pistol scene, and can tell you of something that will be of interest to you in regard to that; Mr. Beecher asked me about that part of it that referred to the pistol scene, and asked me if I remem-ered anything about that part of it that referred to the pistol scene, and of the Beecher if remembered about the pistol scene; of course there was no threat, and I do not wonder that he and not remember it; I do not remember that he and not remember it; I do not remember that he and not remember it; I do not remember that he and not remember it; I do not remember that he and not remember it; I do not remember that he and not remember it; I do not remember the control at my house when she came there to see Mr. Beecher, when she tried to get him to pres de at her meeting; that meeting was arranged by a letter; I think Mr. Beecher brought me that letter; I do not think I had neard about the letter being sent to sir. Beecher's presiding on the same day he saw Mrs. Woodhuil at my house; I had no conversation on the subject previously; I did not tell Mrs. Woodhuil at my house; I had no conversation on the subject previously; I did not vanid Mr. Beecher to know that her letter came at our instance; I think Mrs. Woodhuil did not remain at my house that night; I never commod Mr. Titton at Mrs. Woodhuil did not remain at my house that night; I never man at my house that night; I never ound Mr. Titton at Mrs. Titton's first statement to the committee; one was veroul.

Q. Did you advise against Mr. Titton's first statement to the committee; one was veroul.

Q. They were not all to the committee? A. Yes, sir. that Is the second struement; It never was published; I condemned the Be

has been made to Mrs. Victoria Woodhult for certain letters of mine, supposed — Moulton (interrupting) —What page?

Mr. Porter—247.

for certain letters of mine, supposed to contain information respecting certain inflamous stories against ms. She has two business letters, one declining an invitation to a sulfage meeting and the other to give her assistance solicited. Those and all the letters of mine in the hands of any other person they have my cordist assent to publish. I will only add in this connection that the stories and rumors which have for, a time been circulated about me are grossly untrue, and I stamp them in general and in particular as unterly raise.

Judge Porter—Why did you concur in striking out this word "malse" and the word "untrue" inserted; the phraseology was made by Mr. Kinsella.

Judge Fullerton then stated that he thought there was a misprint somewhere, and when the original document was examined it was found that "faise" was correct.

Witness—I told Mr. Beecher he might fall into a mistake by call ng the committee of investigation; by advice of counse! I wroe nim the letter that idd on August 4; I was not in litigation at that time, nor did I expect to be; my adviser told me to write that letter; General Butler was my adviser; he wrote me a letter on June 29 or 20; that was the first that I heard from him; I had not written to him before; he has been a friend to me before—an adviser, the same as he was in this case; I have never paid him a fee or employed him as a lawyer; I do not think be was ever connected with our affairs in Washington; he had been counsel for Mr. Jayne against us in that business; that was not a relation between him and me, sir; I don't understain the question in that way; that was not a relation between him and me, sir; I don't understain the guestion in that way; that was not a relation between him and me, sir; I don't understain the guestion in that way that was not a relation between him and me, sir; I don't understain the firth Avenue Hote; I timik General Butl

penses of this litigation in any form; I do not think I have contributed to the publications that have been made from time to time; I have paid nothing and promised nothing; all that I paid was in my own litigation.

Q. In connection with the indictments?

Mr. Beach—Wait one moment. I object to any evidence of any liber suit.

Judge Neilson—All that I have ruled out.

Mr. Evarts—It does not bear upon this witness in weighing his testimony by the Court or jury. I understand, your Honor, that when we offered to show the attende of this witness under the publication of the indictments, and under the civil suits for libers, you ruled that that does not constitute evidence to affect his credit with the jury as to his statements in this case.

Judge Neilson—I so ruled. It has been decided more than once in this case that a criminal indictment does not affect the testimony of the witness.

Mr. Evarts—I do not say that, but it is that he is made a party delendant on the same side of a controvers, in which he now appears as a witness. In the condition of persecution or not,

Judge Neilson—I don't know that it is.

Mr. Evarts—Nor I; but that he holds that position in regard to the suits flied against him, justly or unjustly. He is indicted for hele against Mr. Beecher.

Judge Neilson—That does not affect him here.

Mr. Evarts—Nor I; but that goes to show the animus or opposition between the witness and the party against whom he is bestifying is primary evidence to show that he is not a disinterested and importial witness, but its lamself a party in the controversy, and now we offer this position in all these suits as evidence that he is not an impartial witness, but is a party to the controversy.

Judge Neilson—I am ruling on the assumption that some third person not named has had, or has, some litigation with the witness, a case in which that third person was the mover. We have it siready that his witness is hostile to the defendant, avoved by nimself yesterday. That fact distinctly appears.

Mr. Evarts—Have we it down

ant, avowed by himself yesterday. That fact distinctly appears.

Mr. Evarts—Have we it down on the record that he has said that he is a hostile witness?

Judge Neilson—Their friendly relations ceased.

Mr. Evarts—On, their friendly relations ceased.

That is not an avown; that he is nostile and bitterly hostile.

Judge Neilson—Your indictment is broad enough.

anough.

Ar. Evarts—That the jury will judge of.
Judge Neilson—I toink you must be content
with an exception.

Mr. Evarts—But Your Honor tells me you exclinds it on the idea that it is a mere transaction
with a third person.

Judge Neilson—In part.

Mr. Evarts—Well, in part. Then the part that
is pay with a third person.

Judge Neilson—Is ruled out.

Mr. Evarts—The third person! How is it a third
person!

Judge Neilson—Is ruled out.

Mr. Evaris—The third person! How is it a third person?

Judge Neilson—On your statement, that a third person has brought suit against the witness.

Mr. Evaris—And he has been indicted and is the descudant.

Mr. Evaris—And he has been indicted and is the descudant.

Mr. Evaris—We don't offer the indictment as proving its truth. I offer it as a prosecution against him on the complaint of Mr. Beconer, and four fonor excludes that as not bearing on the question as to whether the witness is biassed.

Judge Neilson—It is very clear to me. A brings an action against B for a large estate. B cannot turn around and bave the chief witness indicted in order to affect his testimony before a jury.

Mr. Evaris—I offer it as affecting the animus of the witness, These things are quite distinguishable, if Your Honor please.

Judge Neilson—I am very clear about this. I do not wish any extended remarks.

Mr. Evaris—I do not propose to argue it any further; out i propose to lace Your Honor's ruling in definite form. We offer to prove by this withess the position in which he stands in reference both to the public prosecution and the civil suits that have grown up since this controversy between Mr. Tilion and Mr. Beccher arose other than this suit. We will embrace the whole, and Your Honor rules them out.

Judge Neilson—They will us so found, and I make the same ruling.

The Court then adjourned until two P. M.

Francis D. Moulton was recalled, and his cross-examination was resumed by ex-judize Porter. He was questioned as to his latter of August 5, and

what it meant: He replied that it was a reply to a letter from Mr. Beecher, dated August 4. Q. At the time that reply was prepared was any one resent except you and Mr. Tilton? A. I do

of what it peace in creation of the active and active and active and active and active and active ac the witness and the party it may be given against, and that can always be shown without pursuing a detailed inquiry into the circumstances attending its development." That authority, sir, very abundantly sustains the proposition which I submitted to Your Honor yesterday, and which you at once recognized as law. Now it may be said, sir, that this letter of Mr. Beecher, upon August 4, necessarily came under the observation of Mr. Thiton at the time he was engaged mutually with Mr. Moniton in preparing the reply to that instrument. It will be for Your Honor's consideration how far the presentation of that letter to Mr. Thiton—if it was submitted to him, which does not appear—and how are its acceptance or repudiation of the statements of that letter may be admissible. Certainly, sufficient yet has not been given to allow the production of that letter under that aspect of the question.

Mr. Everts—As I understand this letter was not objected to.

Mr. Evaris—As I understand this letter was not objected to.
Mr. Beach—I object to that letter, or any part of that letter which, in the judgment of Your Honor, will lay a foundation for the introduction of Mr. Beecher's letter.
The Judge—Ar. Evarts may read the last letter. WHAT MOULTON SAID TO BRECHER WHEN ASKED FOR DOCUMENTS, Counsel for plaintiff then read the letter as fol-

Counsel for plaintiff then read the letter as follows:—

No. 49 Remem Street, Aug. 5, 1874.

Rev. Henry Ward Brecher:—
My Dear Sir—in all our acquaintance and friendship I have never received from you a letter of the tone of yours of August 4. It seems unlike yourself, and to have been inspired by the same itt advisers who had so lamentably carried your private affairs before a committee of your church and thence before the public.

In reply, let me remind you that during the whose of the past four years all the documents, notes and memoranda, which you and Mr. Thiton have intrusted to me, have been so intrusted because they had a reterence to your mutual differences. I hold no papers, either of yours or his, except such as bear on this case. You speak of "memoranda of affairs not immediately connected with Mr. Thiton's matter." You probably allude here to the memoranda of your difficulties with Mr. Bitton's matter." You probably allude here to the memoranda of reference. You speak also of a letter or two from your brother and sister, and I am sure you have not torgotten the apprehension which we entertained lest Mrs. Hooker should full a design which his foreshadowed to Anvale your pulpit and read to your congregation a confession of your intimacy with Mrs. Thiton.

You speak of other papers, withen I hold "subject to your whines." I hold mone such, nor do I hold any subject to Mr. This wishes. The papers with its to prevent the wish of one pity from being injuriously exercised against the other.

You see the retrieve and the Mr. This on the contrary, I have reduced Mr. This on the contrary, I have reduced Mr. This on the contrary, I the wish of one party from being Injuriously exercised against the other.

You are incorrect in saying that Mr. Tilton had access to my "depository of materials." On the contrary, I have refused Mr. Filton such access. During the preparation of his sworn stanch the came to me and said his case would be incomplete unless I permatted him the use of all the documents, but I reduced, and all he could rely upon were seen notes as he had made from time to time from writings of yours which you had written to me to be road to him, and passages of which he caught from my tips in shorthand. Mr. Tilton has seen only a part of the papers in my nosession, and would be more surprised to learn the entire mets of the case than you can possibly be.

from my lips in shorthand. Mr. Tilton has seen only a part of the papers in my nowession, and would be more surprised to learn the entire facts of the case than you can possibly be.

What die rumors may have existed in newspaper offices I know not, but they have not come from me.

In closing your letter you say, "I don't ask you to place before the committee any papers which Mr. litton may have given you, but I do demand that you forthwith place before the committee every paper which I have written or deposited with you." In reply, I can only say that I cannot issuity place before the committee the papers of one of the parties without doing the same with the papers of one of the parties without doing the same with the papers of the other, and I cannot do this bonorably execut either by loral process compelling me or else by execut either by loral process compelling me or else by execut in writing not only of yourselt, but of Mr. Tilton, with whom I shall confer on the subject as speedly as possible I trust, see a greater spirit of justice in this reply than you have minused into your unusual letter of August 4. Very respectfully.

Mr. Evarts—We offer in evidence the letter to which the one just read is an answer, it having been communicated to and read oy Mr. Tilton.

Mr. Beach—That may be true, out it does not appear in evidence, and, in my judgment, it should appear from the witness' direct examination whether the contents of the letter were communicated to Mr. Tilton or not.

Mr. Evarts—There is no pretence that there is any other letter of the sin of August tunn the one I have read. Every word on the letter were communicated to Mr. Tilton, and in that letter be makes tured separate quotations from Mr. Beeche-That would us true if the letter he answers. It is a act within his knowledge.

Mr. heach—That would us true if the letter to which the root was addressed to his chief the land.

RMOIT SIDE.

1871—June 26, received check of H. W. Beecher, \$150. 1872—May 3i, received check of H. W. Beecher, \$150. 1872—May 3i, received check of H. W. Beecher, \$299. 76, 1873—February 18, received \$500; May 20, received cash, \$5,900.

In pencil, footing \$5,100 cl.

Witness said—These statements were taken from the books of the firm of Woodruff & Robinson; the ontries were made at the respective dates on the books; it is taken from my own individual account in the leager. In reply to Mr. Porter, the witness said he would bring the ledger to-morrow to show bith how it was; this statement was an extract from witness's account with the firm.

ment was an extract room witness a decount rather firm.

Q. How does it happen that all the sums received by you from Mr. Beecher do not appear in the account? A. I thank there were some sums which I received in currency, and which I immediately paid out; I did not deposit them; these

which I received in currency, and which I immediately paid out; I did not deposit them; these do not appear in the account.

Q. That occurred in several instances? A. I do not know; I think in one or two: I have no means of ascertaining this, as I did not keep a memorandum; as I received enecks I had the money deposited to my credit.

Q. If the books show an account between you and the firm, no w does it show an individual account between you and Mr. Beecher? A. It is put down so from a memorandum. I received the account from our accountant. I believe Ir. Tition has one of his own.

Mr. Porter—We would like to have the ledger. What does it show? A. It shows my credit account and the checks that I paid out.

Q. What is there on the books to show to who the checks were paid? A. The account which is kept there was paid from no other money than that of Mr. Beecher.

Q. What is there to show that the money was received from Mr. Beecher? A. The credit on the book is from Mr. Beecher? I. The credit on the book is from Mr. Beecher to me. If you allow me I will show you.

The counsel here handed the witness the balance sheet to which he cierred as being a traascript from the books of the account between Henry ward Beecher and Francis D. Moulton, and the latter, quietly perusing the paper, read aloud various tems of sums received from Mr. Beecher, with the date and the amounts set forth, and the parties, chiefly Mr. and Mrs. Fitton, to whom the money was paid from time to time. The total amount received comes out as \$2,000.

Q. In the accounts of your firm can it be shown what were the financial transactions between yourself and Mr. Thon.

Q. If I understand you, there was no account then, between your illim and Mr. Beecher on the books of the firm? A. No, sir. there was not.

Q. The occasion for this account appearing on the book was only to biorary on ware.

then, between your firm and Mr. Beecher? A. No, sir; there was not. Q. Nor was there any account between you and Mr. Beecher on the books of the firm? A. No, sir. Q. The occasion for this account appearing on the book was only to inform you ween money was received from Mr. Beecher and when it was paid out by you in cheeks on the firm? A. Yes, sir. Q. When you made currency payments from Mr. Beecher and when they were not given through the firm there would, then, be no account entered of Mr? A. No, sir. Q. Have you got a complete account of the money which you received from Mr. Beecher? A. No, sir. there is no complete account of it unless that be a complete one.

Q. Am I to infer, then, that all the money you received from Mr. Beecher? I have not accounted for on this paper? A. Puice, I believe, I received money from Mr. Beecher? A. I am sure I del not receive it from him three times; I should say that I have not received it from him three times; I should say that I have not received it from him three times.

Q. Can you state, sir, the total amount received by you from Mr. Beecher? A. I cannot, sir.

Q. How much did you receive on any of these occasions? A. On one occasion I believe I received

Q. Can you state, sir, the total amount received by you from Mr. Beecher? A. I cannot, sir.
Q. How much did you receive on any of these occasions? A. On one occasion I believe I received \$300 from him, or thereabouts.
Q. How much at the other time? A. About \$500 I should think.
Q. Did you receive, in January, 1871, from Mr. Titton \$4,000? A. Moid.
Q. When was the first draft made on that money? A. The first draft was made on February 3, 1871.
Q. Did the \$5,000, which you received from Mr. Receaser, enter into that account of Mr. Titton's which kept, in anything? A. No, sir; I don't think it did.
Q. Do you know how Mr. Titton kept his money accounts before he placed the \$4,000 in your care? A. He kept his money, I believe, in bank and with individuals.
Q. This \$4,000 was money which Mr. Tilton gave you to be deposited? A. Yes, sir; it was.
Q. Was thus money given you by him is currency

the party making the reply. It does not appear that the quotations were given to Mr. Moulton to be embodied in the letter.

The Jodge—I think it would be desirable to interrogate the witness on the subject.

Mr. Evarts—Does Your Honor rule that the letter is not evidence at present?

The Judge—I express a wish to hear the witness' statement in regard to the matter.

The witness was then interrogated in regard to the letter. He said that the passages were quoted in the reply by Mr. Tilton and himself.

The ludge—I think the letter may go in now.

BEECHER REBUKES MOULTON AND WANTS HIS PAPERS.

Counsel read the letter as below:—

BROGREY, August 4. 1874.

Or in checks? A. I think it was in checks, but I don't remember positively.

Q. Was there a deposit of \$1,000 about April 5 with you, and on whose account was it made? A. That was on Henry C. Bowen's cheek.

Q. When was the Golden Age established in March. 1871.

Q. Who was the editor and proprietor of the Golden Age? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Yes, sir.

Q. Was there a deposit of \$1,000 about April 5 with you, and on whose account was it made? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Q. Who was the editor and proprietor of the Folden Age? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Yes, sir.

Q. Was nere a deposit of \$1,000 about April 5 with you, and on whose account was it made? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Q. Who was the editor and proprietor of the Folden Age? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Q. Was nere a deposit of \$1,000 about April 5 with you, and on whose account was it made? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Q. Who was the editor and proprietor of the Folden Age? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Q. Was nere a deposit of \$1,000 about April 5 with you, and on whose account was it made? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Q. Who was the editor and proprietor of the Folden Age? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Q. Was nevel seasoulted in March. 1871.

Q. Who was the editor and proprietor of the Folden Age? A. Theodore Tilton was.

Q. Was nevel seasoulted in March. 1871.

Q. Was nevel seasoulted in March. 1871.

Q. Who was the editor and pro

on't know now that stands, it can be ence.

Q. Were there assurances of assistance made in the enterprise? A. Certain parties said they would contribute it the paper should prove successful.

Q. Did you contribute to the undertaking? A. I contributed \$1,500, and I subscribed \$3,000 toward it.

Q. Did you contribute to the undertaking? A. I contributed \$1,500, and I subscribed \$5,000 toward it.

Q. What was the date of your subscribtion and contribution? A. I don't remember exactly.

Q. Was it before or after the publication? A. Probably before the publication.

Q. Can you state when you paid the \$1,500—was it that same year? A. It was that spring, I think.

Q. Did you receive a note from Tilton for the money? A. I did, and I returned thin the note before the close of the year; his notes were made payable if the paper was a success.

Q. What was the date of the note? A. I can't say; the notes were arranged by my partner, Mr. Woodraff; I gave back the note to Mr. Tilton.

Q. Was that after the publication of the life of Victoria Woodhull? A. I believe it was, but I am not certain about that.

Q. What interval occurred between the receipt of these notes and the return? A. The notes were all returned in the latter part of 1871, I think.

Q. What was the aggregate amount of your contribution toward the Golden Age? A. It was about—I don't remember exactly.

Mr. Beach here objected to questioning the witness as to mis business relations with Mr. Tilton, and Mr. Evarts said that though this line of evidence might not be in itself pertinent, it would be shown to be important as connecting facts which they would cheir from his answers. The Court regarded the line of evidence as proper.

Q. What were the conditions upon which these

facts which they would cheft from his answers. The Court regarded the line of evidence as proper.

Q. What were the conditions upon which these notes were made payable? A. They were only made payable in case the Golden Age proved a success.

Q. Did the attempt to publish the paper proves a success? A. It was carried on, but I don't know whether you will consider it in the light of a success.

Q. What was the object of giving the notes back? A. It was in accordance with an understanding with my partners that each member of the firm should give his own notes.

Q. Did any other member of your firm contribute toward the paper? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did any other member of your firm contribute toward the paper? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is there any account in existence of the money you lent him? A. No, sir; I lent him money whenever he was in want of it.

Q. How did you pay him the money—in what form? A. Sometimes in checks.

Q. Let us see them; have you no others here?

Mr. Beach objected to withess being called upon to give the evidence until the checks are produced.

Q. How long have you been lending Mr. Tilton

Mr. Beach objected to witness being called upon to give the evidence until the checks are produced.

Q. How long have you been lending Mr. Tilton money? A. I have lent him money from April, 1871, to the present time.

Q. How much would the total sum lent amount to? A. It is within \$2,000, I think; it does not amount to over \$3,000.

Q. Did you indorse the notes you gave him?. A. I didn't indorse his notes, nor and I become responsible for them.

Q. What amount had you belonging to Mr. Tilton at the time you received the \$5,000 from Mr. Beecher? A. I don't know, sir.

Q. Nor what it approximated to? A. No, sir.

Q. Did Mr. Tilton diaw money in checks from your firm? A. He draw in oneeks, I think, or came himself for a check.

The Beecher counsel here indulged in a brief consultation, and when Mr. Porter again broke the silence he did so saving. "I will now, Mr. Moniton, take a step back and come down to the incidents of the evening of December 30, 1870.

Q. On that day did Mr. Tilton come to your house or did you go to his house? A. He came to my house; after leaving my house I went to Mr. Beecher's house and mot him at the door.

Q. Did you meet him in a friendly spirit.

Q. Were you peremptory in your manner when you met Mr. Beecher on that occasion, or were you polite? A. I was polite in manner to him, sir.

Q. Will you state what you said to Mr. Beecher?

A. I said to Mr. Beecher Mr. Tilton wants you to come to my house, and he replied that it was prayer meeting might and he could not get away; I said to him he had better get some one else to attend the prayer meeting might and he replied that it was prayer meeting might and he sould not get away; I said to him he had better get some one else to attend the prayer meeting might and he sould not get away; I said to him he had better get some one else to attend the prayer meeting might and he sould not get away; I said to him he had better get some one else to attend the prayer meeting might and he could not get away; I said to him he had better get some one el

Q. Did Mr. Tilton call to see you about the letter?
A. No, sir; he sent for me, A. No. sir: he sent for me.
Q. Did he give you the letter to read? A. No.
sir; he told me what the substance of the letter

was.

Q. What was said about the contents of Mr. Bowen's letter? A. He said that Bowen had told him of Mr. Becker's adulteries, and that he had told Bowen that Mr. Beecher had made unhand-some advances toward his wife, and he told me that Bowen charged warious afulteries on Beecher, and that he had made confessions of them.

Q. Did he specify the adulteries or the names of the parties with whom they were committed?

A. He did not specify the adulteries or the parties.

Q. Did you ask him about them? A. I asked him what unhandsome advances had been made to his wife, but he would not say; he said that Bowen promised to furnish him with the evidence of the adulteries, but had not done so; he gave that information to me as an excuse for his not

of the adulteries, but had not done so; he gave that information to me as an excuse for his not having Bowen's signature to his letter to Beecher; I took a memorandum of what he told me at the sime and used it in my statement.

Q. Was that the day on which you noted the precise nour in which you came in this connection in regard to the alleged intimacy between the plaintiff and defendant? A. I noted it down on a paper when Tilton gave me the information.

Q. Have you got that paper? A. I have the paper—it is here.

Q. What was the date on which you wrote that?

A. It was in the afternoon of December 26, 1870, about three o'clock, that Tilton made this communication to me; I noted the hour because it was important to Tilton; I made the memorandum also to show my authority on the subject.

Q. You have given all the conversation which occurred on that occasion. A. I gaw him several times afterward at my house, and I was frequently at his nouse; I saw Tilton between the 26th and the 30th of December two or three times; I saw him on the 27th; he came voluntarily; he told me then that he had sent word to Mr. Bowen that he was going to see Beecher, and said that Bowen had previously promised to give him the evidence; he said Bowen had threatened to discharge him from his papers if he told what he said about these adulteries; but that he would not be influenced by any threat.

Q. Was anything said in relation to the particulars of the letter to Mr. Beecher in regard to Mr. Bowen? A. I do not know that he said anything to me on the 28th of December in regard to sending him that letter; the next interview was December 30; there had been no conversation during the interval in regard to the communication

Howen? A. I do not know that he said anything to me on the 28th of December in regard to sending him that letter; the next interview was December 30; there had been no conversation during the interval in regard to the communication about Mis. Thiron; when Mr. Thiron came to my house that evening I was not aware that Bowen had failed to sustain the allegation about Mr. Beecher; Mr. Thiron in these successive interviews said he nad no doubt of the truth of Mr. Bowen's statement; in his letter of January, 1871, he gave the substance of the interview which he had with Mr. Bowen on that subject; Mr. Thiron, in the interview of December 28, said he had no doubt of the truth of Mr. Bowen's stoay, because of the unhandsome advances which Mr. Beecher made to his wise (Mrs. Thiron).

Q. Had air. Thiron previously ever said anything to you injurious to the moral character of Mr. Beecher? A. Not until December 26; at that time he said Mr. Beecher's longer preaching was an imposition on Plymouta church.

Q. Was there anybody present at the time? A. Don't remember that there was any one present when he told me that.

Q. Had he ever said anything previously detrimental to Mr. Beecher's moral character? A. He spoke of him as acking pointical courage; that was before 1870; that was said in relation to the Cleveland letter.

Q. When in December, 1870, Mr. Thiron told you Mr. Beecher preached to several of his mistresses every Sunday, did you beneve it?

Objected to, and objection overruled by the Court.

A. I couldn't and didn't believe it at the time.

Q. Four whe was a memoer of Plymouth church at that time? A. Yes, sir.

Q. When did she cease to attend? A. I can't answer that qualiton; I don't know.

Q. Und she ever attend alter 1870? A. She did for some time alter January, 1871.

Q. Under the communicant, nor has she been since 1870—not since she came in possession of the facts.

Q. When did she cease to attend? A. I can't answer that qualiton; I don't know.

Q. Did she ever attend alter 1870? A. She did for some time alter

No. sir.

Q. When did you last attend religious services at Plymouth church? A. I last attended Plymouth church on the evening that the investigating Committee made their report. (Laughter.) I understood there was going to be a meeting of the

stood there was going to be a meeting of the caurch.

Q. That was not an snswer to my question. When did you last attend religious services in Plymouth church? A. I don't remember the occasion particularly, but it was with my wife.

Q. Since the Sunday in 1658 when you sat in Mr. Titton's pew and were introduced by him to Mr. Beecher? A. Yes, sir. Witness said that Mr. George C. Robinson, who is alse wife's uncle and head of the firm of Woodruff & Robinson, is a pewhoder in total caurch, and that me (Moulton) was in the habit of subscribing to the caurch when ne was wont to attend there.

The examination at tids point closed, and Caurt adioarued until cleven o'clock this torange.